

ADELAIDE INSTITUTE

PO Box 3300
Adelaide 5067
Australia
Mob: 61+401692057
Email: info@adelaideinstitute.org
Web: <http://www.adelaideinstitute.org>

Online
ISSN 1440-9828



January 2010 No 480



POLANSKI DOUBLE STANDARD

By Simon Hickey Jack.sparrow@live.com.au September 2009

The case of Roman Polanski discussed in the media recently highlights the double standard the media imposes on one of its own, when reporting on abhorrent crimes committed by one of 'the chosen'. You may have guessed by now where this article is leading, but for now lets look at the facts. In 1977 as a 44-year-old man, Polanski asked Samantha Gaileys's mother if he could photograph her for Vogue magazine. Gailey was 13 at the time. Her mother consented, and the photo shoot took place in the home of Jack Nicholson. During the photo shoot, Polanski asked the girl to change in front of him, which she was uncomfortable with. He also requested that she drink champagne, all in the name of art. The sedative drug 'Quaaludes' was also given to the girl. Was this also in the name of art? After the shoot Polanski took Gailey to the bedroom and forcibly kissed her, raped her, and sodomised her.

On the facts, this is an open and shut case, which Polanski pleaded guilty to in a Los Angeles court. It is a tale of a depraved, sadistic and perverted man, which didn't just blur the boundaries of 'art' and good taste. It wasn't a case of a girl slightly underage engaged in consensual sex with a high school sweetheart. It is a case of an old man raping a girl 31 years his junior, 5 years under the legal age of consent, while plying her with drugs and alcohol.

One would imagine Polanski would still be locked up for a crime such as this. He would be if he were just an average citizen. Polanski skipped bail and never showed in court for sentencing. He was apprehended in Switzerland earlier this month. It seems since he skipped bail in the United States 30 odd years ago, he has been touring the world, making movies and screenplays. One must ask, why he hasn't been arrested and extradited before 2009? One must ask why Hollywood, and the elite of European Politics, has rallied to his aid? People from Nicholas Sárközy to Whoopi Goldberg are now going out in defence of Polanski asking that his crimes be forgiven, forgotten and brushed aside because he is a 'great film director'.

What the media are not reporting – even in Australia – is the *real* reason for all these calls for leniency on Polanski. Anyone care to guess? Roman Polanski is Jewish. The girl he raped was a gentile. (Gentile is the Jewish word referring to any person who is not Jewish). It is also interesting to note here that the Jewish word for a gentile girl is 'shiksa'. Shiksa literally translated means unclean meat. I can hear the cries of 'Anti – Semite' now. To report on such unflattering events must be anti – Semitic. For me to report that Roman Polanski is Jewish means that I must be a Nazi.

Lets look at it another way. Take Dennis Ferguson for instance. A man found guilty of a nearly identical crime, a man

who served many years in prison for that crime. A man who even today, never gets a minutes peace from the media or his neighbours. The media follows this man around and has labeled him all sorts of things such as 'Inhuman Monster', 'Sexual predator' and the like. It is this same media who now call for the release of Polanski on 'Humanitarian' grounds. The same media that promoted Polanski's work sang his virtues and jumped to his defence when his sordid past was revealed. Do we need any more hard evidence that the media is unashamedly biased when it comes to reporting on Jewish crimes, as opposed to crimes committed by mere gentiles? Why would the media allow such double standards? The answer to that is easy when one cares to dodge the cries of anti Semitism and investigate who owns the media. 97% of all western media, this includes Australia, USA, UK, France, Canada and every gentile nation on earth is owned and operated by Jews. This is a fact not even denied by Jews themselves. Is it also anti - Semitic to report on this? Is it anti - Semitic to be alarmed by the fact that practically all our news, opinions, current affairs, political commentators are screened before they are allowed to get their news aired by the mass media? There are many articles online about this ultra concentrated ownership of world media. It is not an imaginary figure or a nasty conspiracy theory. Verify it and see for yourself.

Ever wondered why every year there is yet another docudrama made for TV movie about the so-called 'Holocaust' during WWII? Since 1946 there have been hundreds of movies, thousands of books and many TV shows given world wide acclaim for their portrayal of Jewish suffering during WWII. An alien visitor on Earth might even think that the holocaust is still happening, the amount of media coverage it gets. The impression one gets from all this media coverage is that WWII was merely a sideshow compared with the Jewish suffering that occurred during those years. The Nazi's made 3 anti Semitic films in 12 years between 1933 - 1945. By comparison, just this year alone we got 3 anti - German films. There was Jewish director Tarantino's 'Inglourious Basterds'. Jewish owned, United Studios ' Valkyrie', and 'The White Ribbon'.

It is this same media who have now obtained 136 signatories among top Hollywood directors calling for Polanski's immediate release. The very same people who label Dennis Ferguson a monster. The very same people who push for the extradition and trial of a 90 year old Ukrainian man for allegedly being a guard at a prison camp in Poland 70 years ago.

Hervey Weinstein, the Jewish mega mogul studio owner has called on 'every US filmmaker to lobby against Polanski's extradition to the US to face punishment for the 'so called crime' end quote. This was a crime Polanski pled guilty to. A crime that was no doubt committed by him. And now it is being labeled a 'so called' crime by those in positions of major influence on public opinion. Would it be a 'so called' crime if your 13-year-old daughter was drugged, raped and sodomised by a man 31 years her senior?

If anything this case has allowed many gentiles to now see the power the Jewish wield over media, governments and finance. Why wasn't Polanski extradited from France all those years ago? He wasn't in hiding; he was receiving awards for his filmmaking prowess. Why is it now that we are seeing French president Nicholas [Sarkozy](#) appealing for Polanski's immediate release? Why would any world leader call for the immediate release and pardon of a convicted child rapist? Hint : look at the similarities in their names and guess their heritage.

Why do we allow such double standards in our media, in our governments and in our laws? We allow Polanski to go free, make millions in films, and live out a normal life, while Dennis Ferguson gets hounded till his last dying breath for a nearly identical crime.

If you managed to read this far, despite alarm bells in your head from the 'so - called' anti Semitism, then I implore you to do some investigation of your own. Start online. You are not allowed to purchase or read much of the materials contained online in Australia, as our freedom of speech laws have long been dead. The government does not allow us to purchase many reading materials because they are considered 'anti - Semitic'. Now a euphemism for truth. In Australia we locked up Dr. Frederick Toben for publishing a video online that contained evidence that the Jews have exaggerated the 'Holocaust' for financial benefit. A 70-year-old man sits in jail now, not for violence, theft or rape, but for expressing an opinion, and sharing it. The Murdoch (News Ltd.) media commentators who called for Dr Töben's prosecution, are now are calling for the release of a man who has admitted drugging, raping and sodomising a 13-year-old girl. Any guesses as to Murdoch's lineage?

Investigations might start with David Duke.org, then do a search on media ownership, then maybe do a search on 'Anne Frank's Diary'. You will see this too is a fraud. Search Benjamin Frankins warning about Jews, George Washingtons appraisal of their present and ongoing threat to the United States. Rothschilds contribution to starting both world wars. Search Ernest Zündel, Dr. Robert Faurisson, and finally David Irving. See how the media constantly howls for their immediate incarceration for the crimes of merely expressing an opinion in a western nation.

The Jewish bible – the Talmud – instructs that all Jews are 'the chosen' and any crime against a 'Goyim' is not a crime at all. The only time a Jew commits a crime is when it is done to a fellow Jew. In this case Samantha Gailey (Now Samantha Geimer) is the 'Goyim' and therefore it is no crime at all. Just a 'so - called' crime. 'Goyim' literally translates as cattle. Cries of Nazi or anti - Semitism can be heard whenever this is brought to light.... Again, check for yourself. Google 'goyim' or 'shiksa', then look into a translated Hebrew Bible. The words are there for everybody to see. Is it now a crime to report the truth? It seems so. Ernest Zündel, Dr Robert Faurisson, Dr Fredrick Töben and David Irving are living examples.

In conclusion, it's a sad state of affairs in the world today, that the worlds media, banks and governments are run by 'the chosen', for the benefit of 'the chosen', with the blessing of the 'goyim'. If you believe that the Samantha Geimer rape case is worth taking exception to, then pass this on. If you consider that Polanski committed a real crime, and not just a 'so - called' crime, then pass this on. If you take exception to anybody raping a 13-year-old girl, whether Jewish, Gentile, Chinese or even Eskimo, then pass this on. Let us not remain silent on this total control of public opinion any longer.



Samantha Gailey as a 13 year old



Roman Polansky

As Demjanjuk trial nears, prosecutors confident they can convict

By [Toby Axelrod](#) · November 23, 2009



A photo of John Demjanjuk, circa 1943, the year he is accused of being an accessory to the murder of 29,700 Jews at the Sobibor death camp in Poland. – EI1604 / Wikimedia Commons.

BERLIN (JTA) -- Whether in a wheelchair or on his own two feet, John Demjanjuk will enter Munich District Court on Nov. 30 to stand trial for World War II-era crimes against humanity. He is charged as an accessory to the murder of 29,700 Jews at the Sobibor death camp in Poland.

The trial, which some are billing as the last major Nazi war crimes case, marks another landmark for Germany's confrontation with its Nazi past. It will be the second war crimes trial for Demjanjuk, 89, who was born in Ukraine and immigrated to the United States after the war.

In 1988, Israeli courts convicted Demjanjuk and sentenced him to death for murder and savagery at the Treblinka death camp. But the sentence was overturned in 1993 when the Israeli Supreme Court determined there was insufficient evidence that Demjanjuk was the so-called guard named "Ivan the Terrible," and he was released.

Today, prosecutors say they have all the proof they need that Demjanjuk actively participated in the mass murder of Jews in the gas chambers of Sobibor in 1943. "The totality of evidence is overwhelming," said Barbara Stockinger, spokeswoman for the state prosecutor in Munich. An SS identification card places Demjanjuk in the death camp, and his number shows up on many documents related to Sobibor.

The prosecution alleges that Demjanjuk, after being captured by the Germans in 1942, received training at the Trawniki SS facility in occupied Poland, which produced guards for several death camps.

Demjanjuk insists he merely served in the Soviet army and was captured by Germany in 1942. Much of the evidence against him was gathered by the U.S. Justice Department's Office of Special Investigations to prove that Demjanjuk had lied about his role in the Holocaust to gain U.S. citizenship.

In October 2002, U.S. District Judge Paul Matia "found that he had contributed to the mass murder of Jews by asphyxiation with poison gas, and that he had served voluntarily at the camps," said Eli Rosenbaum, director of the OSI, which had been investigating Demjanjuk since 1977.

Demjanjuk, an autoworker who lived in suburban Cleveland, eventually was stripped of his U.S. citizenship and, after exhausting his appeals, was deported to Germany in May 2009. Germany has jurisdiction to try Demjanjuk because 1,900 of his

alleged victims were German Jews, and because Demjanjuk stayed in a Munich DP camp after the war. If convicted, Demjanjuk faces several years in jail -- reportedly a maximum of seven. The trial itself could take a couple of years.

For some in Germany, the Demjanjuk trial is reminiscent of the first major postwar trials of Nazis by Germans, including the Auschwitz trials of 1963-65, when Germany put 22 citizens on trial for their roles as mid- and lower-level officials at Auschwitz. The trials served to wake up the postwar generation to the horrors their parents had tried to forget.

In contrast, the Nuremberg trials, which took place immediately after the war, were conducted by the Allies and seen by many Germans as victors' justice, Rosenbaum said. "I felt then, and I feel now as an older man, that these trials [in German courts] are important," said Wolfgang Benz, director of Berlin's Center for Research on Anti-Semitism.

As a history student, Benz observed the trial of high-level SS member Karl Wolff in Munich in 1964. Now his daughter Angelika, a doctoral student and expert on the Trawniki SS camps, is planning to attend the Demjanjuk trial.

"There is no statute of limitations for the crime of murder. It doesn't matter if this old guy is sick or if he is nearly 90 years old," Benz said. "The issue of dealing with our past will never end, and Demjanjuk is the case for today."

While some are hyping the Demjanjuk trial as the last major Nazi war-crimes trial, Nazi hunter Efraim Zuroff, director of the Jerusalem office of the Simon Wiesenthal Center, said "That's been said for years, so don't jump to hasty conclusions." Similar billing was given to Nazi trials in the 1980s, Zuroff said.

Rosenbaum, who has been asked to testify in the Demjanjuk trial, said he recently came across a Newsweek story about the prosecution of Kurt Lischka in Germany from 1979 with the headline, "The Last Nazi Trial?" In fact, "We still have nine or 10 cases in the legal system here," Rosenbaum said.

Would-be perpetrators must understand, he said, "that there is a real chance that they will be pursued -- and not for months or years but if necessary for decades, even into old age and even into countries at great distances from the ones in which they committed the crimes."

<http://jta.org/news/article/2009/11/23/1009359/demjanjuk-nazi-trial-set-to-begin-in-germany>

The Man Who Won't Let Nazis Die In Peace: An Interview With Efraim Zuroff

Elliot Resnick, Jewish Press Staff Reporter, November 18 2009



Efraim Zuroff

*Nazi hunting. Sounds like a glamorous job, but judging from **Operation Last Chance**, a new book by Nazi hunter Efraim Zuroff, catching Nazis is more grit than glamour.*

In the book, published by Palgrave MacMillan, Zuroff recounts his recent painstaking efforts in finding aging Nazis and their collaborators around the world and convincing often reluctant local governments to extradite and prosecute them.

Zuroff, who heads the Simon Wiesenthal Center's Jerusalem office, has been helping catch and punish Nazi war criminals since 1980. Brought up in Brooklyn and a graduate of Yeshiva University, Zuroff later received his doctorate from Hebrew University and today lives in Efrat. The Jewish Press recently spoke with him.

The Jewish Press: Some of the war criminals the Simon Wiesenthal Center hunts are over 90 years old. Why chase people for crimes committed over 60 years ago?

Zuroff: The passage of time in no way diminishes the guilt of the killers. We don't think people deserve a medal simply because they reach an old age.

To the best of my knowledge, there isn't a country in the civilized world (save Sweden) that limits prosecution for genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity based on age. The issue is not the person's age; it's whether or not he or she is mentally and physically capable of standing trial.

I have a case now in Budapest of someone whose date of birth is 1914, which makes him 95 years old. But he's in very good health. He lives by himself, takes care of all his needs, he's busy suing me for libel, running around giving interviews, and fighting against us in every single way possible. There's no reason to ignore him just because his date of birth is 1914.

If we were to set a limit based on age it would mean that if you were lucky enough and/or rich enough and/or smart enough to elude justice until you reach that age, you're off the hook. That would obviously be a travesty.

We also feel that the victims of the Shoah deserve that their persecutors be held accountable for their crimes. How would it look if we stopped and then a person asked us, "What about this person who murdered my grandmother during the Shoah?"

You write in the book that some Jewish communities around the world do not appreciate your Nazi-hunting activities. Why?

Some communities [especially in Eastern Europe] feel vulnerable to anti-Semitism and they're afraid that [cooperating with us] will increase anti-Semitism.

In Eastern Europe anti-Semitism is of the traditional sort. It doesn't have to do with the Middle East like in Western Europe. It's the usual things, like "The Jews killed Jesus." In other words, typical anti-Semitic themes based on economic, religious, nationalistic and ethnic reasons.

Remember, in these countries we're running after local Nazi war criminals. We're pressing local governments to put their own people - Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Ukrainians, and Croatians - on trial in their own countries for collaborating with the Nazis.

Which countries have been the most cooperative in prosecuting Nazis and their collaborators, and which have been the least cooperative?

The country with the best record in the world is undoubtedly the United States. However, it's easier to win Nazi war crimes cases in the United States because the people are not being prosecuted on criminal charges but rather for immigration and naturalization violations. In the States all you have to prove is that someone lied on his immigration or citizenship application. Many people claimed they were students, farmers, or officials, masking the fact that they had been members of security police units, guards in concentration camps and the like.

Elsewhere in the world, with the exception of Canada, which does the same thing as America, you have to prove that someone actually committed a crime or was an accessory to a crime.

How about the least cooperative country?

I would place the least cooperative countries in two different categories. There are countries like the Ukraine, which has refused to do anything. In other words, they have never even investigated a local Ukrainian Nazi war criminal since they've become independent.

And then there are countries that carry out investigations - and, in some cases, even trials - but they're just going through the motions while doing everything possible to prevent the criminals from being punished.

The classic examples in that regard are Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. But you also have countries like Austria, which has not successfully prosecuted a Nazi war criminal in more than 30 years - and it's not because there are no Nazi war criminals in Austria.

Why are these countries so uncooperative?

Because it's politically incorrect and difficult to punish local Nazi war criminals. They don't want to draw attention to the serious extent of their own collaboration with the Nazis.

You also see this in the recent and very dangerous attempts by post-Communist Eastern European countries to equate the crimes of Communism with the crimes of Nazism. This is really an attack on the Jewish narrative of the Holocaust. The leaders in this regard are the Baltic countries, and for good reason. In Eastern Europe Jews are very much identified with Communism, so if they can gain recognition that Communism equals Nazism,

that means the Jews are as bad as the Nazis. This would then deflect blame from their collaboration with the Nazis during World War II and their failure to bring their own Nazi war criminals to justice.

What would you say has been your greatest achievement?

I think one of my greatest achievements was my role in facilitating the prosecution of Dinko Sakic, who was the commandant of the Jasenovac concentration camp, one of the worst concentration camps in Europe, in which at least 90,000 civilians - mostly Serbs, but also 18,000 Jews, gypsies and anti-Fascist Croatians - were murdered. Sakic was one of the commanders of the camp, and we exposed him in Argentina and saw to it that he was extradited to stand trial in Croatia. He got the maximum sentence of 20 years and died in prison.

How about your biggest failure or disappointment?

The biggest disappointment was that we didn't find Dr. Albert Heim, the infamous "Doctor Death" from the Mauthausen concentration camp. I went all over the world to search for him. I was in Chile, Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay trying to find him, but we were not successful.

[The New York Times recently reported] that he died in Cairo in 1992, but it's impossible to verify that contention because there's no body. Had we found him it would have been a fantastic coup, and it would've been a trial of great importance. But, listen, what could I say? It's a tremendous job, but it doesn't always end nicely or with success.

How many new Nazis or Nazi collaborators have you discovered since you launched Operation Last Chance in 2002?

We started Operation Last Chance in 13 different countries, and we received the names of 536 suspects, which passed three tests. Test number one was that the information was credible. In other words, if someone said to me, "I have a very nasty neighbor who's 87 years old and has a German accent; he must be a Nazi," that's obviously not credible. That's meaningless. But if he said, "I have a neighbor who I know was in a Lithuanian security police battalion that was sent to Belarus," that's serious because there was such a Lithuanian battalion involved in mass murder.

Test number two was a person's health. He had to be alive and healthy enough to stand trial. The third was that he or she - and there were in fact women guards in concentration camps, some of them notorious for their cruelty - had not been previously prosecuted for the crime because if they were we can't prosecute them again.

How many Nazis and Nazi collaborators in total are still alive around the world?

No one knows the answer to that, but every year we establish an annual report on what's going on all over the world. And our latest report shows that as of April 1, 2009, there were 706 ongoing cases of Nazi war criminals throughout the world.

What's the biggest impediment today to catching war criminals?

Lack of political will. Contrary to common perception, in many cases it's not that hard to find the Nazis or the evidence. But if the government responsible for putting this person on trial or extraditing him won't do it, we're in trouble. So I say my job is one-third detective, one-third historian, and one-third political activist.

<http://www.jewishpress.com/pageroute.do/41493/>

Elizabeth Wright : David Irving, the Thought Criminal, November 27 2009

How is it possible, in these United States, that a group of people, who wish to get together to discuss a historical topic, must relentlessly hide their intention, obfuscate their meeting place, and keep their identities secret, if they don't wish to be hounded like wanted criminals? How is it that citizens who wish to meet peacefully do not have the protection of the law, in order to practice what the law supposedly guarantees, that is, freedom of speech and freedom of assembly?

It's not unusual for one party of citizens to be roused to anger by the beliefs and practices of others. This is to be expected. But in this supposed land of the free, we do not expect that opponents of particular views will be allowed license to destroy websites, steal email information, and confiscate personal correspondence, while threatening hotel managers with violence, if they rent space to certain groups or events. It is not anyone's responsibility to provide a platform for the public expression of opinions, but it is the responsibility of the government to protect citizens from those who would prevent such expression.

Whatever became of that bold white American man, descendant of the Founders, who proudly declared, "I may not agree with

what you say, but I'll defend with my life your right to say it?" Is he too busy these days playing with his ever-increasing array of techie toys, gadgets and gizmos, to give a damn about the ongoing loss of one freedom after another, freedoms originally conceived by those 18th century men, who foolishly believed that their singular creation could be entrusted to these very descendants?

These are rhetorical questions to which I expect no answers. I've also ceased expecting indignation from that once watchful and attentive white American man, as he passively accepts the ongoing demise of constitutional principles meant to enforce laws to be obeyed by the high and the lowly.

On November 13, 2009, Professor [David Irving](#) was scheduled to give a talk on World War II history, this one to focus on *Hitler, Himmler and codebreaking*. Irving is a meticulous historian and the author of several acclaimed and respected works of history, including *Nuremberg* and *Churchill's War*.

He is despised by a coterie of adversaries for his dissenting views on aspects of World War II's Holocaust, a subject he does not lecture on, but for which he was sentenced in Austria to

three years in prison. That is, a historian was imprisoned for expressing opinions that conflict with a standardized version of events that took place during the middle of the 20th century. Throughout Europe, powerful interest groups have managed to get laws enacted that forbid historians from engaging in further research or exploration of the forbidden Holocaust topic, for which there is now an established "official" text. You see, Europe is full of the types of countries whose oppressive traditions the Founders of this nation strove to avoid. In their time, it was Kings who could throw you into prison for refusing to conform to the Royal Imperatives.

On November 13, the date of Irving's first intended lecture in New York, hackers broke into his website and AOL email account, confiscating lists of the names of those scheduled to attend his forthcoming lectures. The miscreants then published his email correspondence, along with the user name and password for his website and AOL accounts, and the names and email addresses (in some cases, street addresses) of donors and purchasers of Irving's books. His books, by the way, are not furtively published samizdat, and can be bought in most bookstores, as well as from Amazon.

Well aware of the danger he and his lecture participants are in whenever he speaks, Irving has been forced to establish an elaborate system of subterfuge where he keeps the meeting place secret until almost the last minute, and then emails the location to the interested parties. Due to the damage done to the website, this first meeting was necessarily curtailed.

On November 14, Irving's second scheduled lecture, at the Double Tree Hotel in New York, was invaded and disrupted by a band of self-appointed "anti-fascists," who maced one of the attendants. The offending thugs very proudly published an account of their exploits on websites, bragging about how Irving "just got his ass handed to him."

What we have here are self-elected Enforcers, who have usurped powers never granted to one citizen over another, yet who go unchallenged by any legal authority. These are Enforcers who claim the right to judge which points of view should be permitted to prevail, and which ones shall be banned from the public square.

In their attempts to be credible, Enforcers purposely, with malice aforethought, mischaracterize their perceived enemies in the most extreme fashion, and venomously misinterpret their theses or positions. The dissenting sinner must not be allowed to bring his views directly to the public, or be given the opportunity to offer any type of clarification.

Knowing that volatile terminology is bound to rouse the hackles of average people, most of whom are not paying attention anyway, the Enforcers load their charges against their opponents with such extreme epithets as "Nazi," "racist," "white supremacist." Once so labeled, the targeted subject matter, or group, or individual, is supposed to be doomed.

For example, in the case of the labeling of "Holocaust deniers," this is a lie in itself, since none of these researchers deny that a movement against Jews took place during World War II. However, in our country, a nation ruled by the Constitution, the truth or invalidity of a researcher's position on some historical subject is of no consequence. In the land of Jefferson, Madison and Jay, we have the right to be misguided or simply wrong. If some intrepid soul wishes to give lectures on how Africans enjoyed being slaves and that enslavement was a great favor done for them, his right to lecture is not dependent on whether or not his thesis is correct. That part of it is not the government's business. Its only business is to see to it that this individual, no matter how benighted he might be deemed by foes of his viewpoint, is protected from those who would do him harm, by stealing his property or endangering his person. We do not search for ways to eradicate his freedoms, nor should we set up phoney legal mechanisms to imprison him.

In his own version of that aforementioned declaration, i.e., to defend another's right to speak, even when in disagreement, Thomas Paine wrote, "He that would make his own liberty secure must guard even his enemy from oppression." Today, these 18th century warnings are nothing but corny words, not to be taken seriously by a people who would disgrace themselves by permitting the passage of unconstitutional "hate crime" laws. When a people indicate that they're ready to punish citizens as "Thought Criminals," then nothing that follows can be surprising.

Although I have never attended an Irving lecture, I have read one of his impressive books, and I am on his mailing list. Over the years, I have written on the topic of European repression of scholars, academics and researchers for the Issues & Views website. I list links to some of these articles below:

[Free speech still struggles to survive, in Europe and in the USA](#)

[Europe's Hypocrites and Liars - Part I](#)

[Europe's Hypocrites and Liars - Part II](#)

[When Truth Is No Defense](#)

<http://issuesviews.blogspot.com/2009/11/david-irving-thought-criminal.html>

More German hatred from the British media that can't function without a reference to Adolf Hitler and the National Socialists!

How Hitler and the Nazis tried to steal Christmas

The Nazi Party tried their best to remove Christ from Christmas by paganising carols, producing glittering swastika, iron cross and toy grenade baubles for the fir tree, research for a new exhibition has found. 17 November 2009



The Nazi removed religious references

Many of the changes made under Hitler, put in place to remove the influence of the Jewish-born baby Jesus, are still in use today, much to the alarm of modern Germans.

The swastika-shaped baking trays and wrapping paper adorned with Nazi symbols have long gone, but traces of the Third Reich Christmas can still be found in the subtly rewritten lyrics of favourite carols.

Related Articles

- The discoveries have been highlighted by a new exhibition at the National Socialism Documentation Centre in Cologne. "I always thought that *Unto Us a Time Has Come* was a song about wandering through winter snow," said Heidi Bertelson, 42,

a lawyer who visited the exhibit told Times. "I didn't realise that Christ had been excised."

The Nazi version, which removed the religious references and replaced them with images of snowy fields, remains in some song books and is sung in many households.

The same goes for carols referring to Virgin Birth and lullabies that invoke the Baby Jesus.

The rewriting was supervised by the chief Nazi ideologist Alfred Rosenberg and Heinrich Himmler led the way in de-Christing Christmas.

Their plan was to remove the emotional ties of the Church and merge Christmas into a Julfest, a celebration of winter and light which drew on pagan traditions.

"The most important celebration in the calendar did not match their racist credo so they had to push out the Christian elements," said Judith Breuer, who helped her mother, Rita, pull together the exhibition.

Rita started trawling flea markets in the 1970s in search of her childhood Christmas and turned up boxes of Nazi-era Christmas decorations complete with swastikas and grenades.

"After the Nazis had gone you could still find textbooks on Christmas that use exactly the same phrasing," she told The Times.

* **SS- Viking division was an armoured/Tank division (a combat division,not para-military) involved in the defense of Austria.**

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/topics/christmas/6587738/How-Hitler-and-the-Nazis-tried-to-steal-Christmas.html>

World War II | 17.11.2009

Court charges former Nazi for murdering Jewish laborers



[Jews were used as forced laborers across the Third Reich](#)

German prosecutors have charged a 90-year-old man with the murder of 58 Jewish forced laborers in the final weeks of World War Two. The defendant had been a member of the paramilitary Nazi unit, the SS.

The Duisburg district court said in a statement on Tuesday that the man was being charged with murder in 58 cases. The man allegedly was a member of the paramilitary Fifth SS Tank Division "Viking." Together with other members of his unit, he planned and carried out the executions of at least 57 Jewish forced laborers on March 29, 1945 in Deutsch Schuetzen, a municipality in eastern Austria.

"The laborers were brought to a nearby wood, where they were told to hand over their valuables and then kneel down in a ditch," said court spokesman Ulrich Hermanski in a statement. "The defendant and further SS soldiers then shot the laborers from behind."

Members of the Hitler Youth organization were also believed to have been involved in the massacre.



[The SS were founded as Hitler's protective squadron](#)

The defendant is furthermore accused of shooting from behind "in a cowardly manner" a Jewish forced laborer on the same or next day, Hermanski said. The man was exhausted and couldn't walk anymore on a march with more than 100 forced laborers near Jabing in Austria.

Led by Nazi ideology

Media reports have identified the defendant as Adolf Storms. But prosecutors have not named the man, who lives in the western German city of Duisburg.

"The prosecution assumes that the defendant was led by an extremely hostile and inhuman attitude towards the victims, whom he considered inferior, in accordance with National Socialist ideology," Hermanski said.

The Duisburg court will now have to decide whether to put the elderly man on trial. He has two weeks to present evidence or appeal against the case proceeding.

Listed in the telephone book

The news magazine *Der Spiegel* reported last October that investigators had their attention drawn to the man thanks to research into the massacre by 28-year-old Austrian student Andreas Forster. He located the 90-year-old by simply looking up his name in a German telephone directory.

Forster travelled to Duisburg and filmed hours of interviews over several days, finding the elderly man to be "sprightly" but unable to recollect the day of the massacre.

"We informed prosecutors in July," Forster told the magazine. In December, police raided the man's residence and seized documents.

Meanwhile, the trial of suspected Nazi death camp guard John Demjanjuk is due to start on November 30 in Munich. The 89-year-old Demjanjuk has been charged with helping to kill 27,900 Jews while a guard at the Sobibor death camp in Nazi-occupied Poland in 1943.

Ukrainian-born Demjanjuk, deported from the United States in May, is number three on the Simon Wiesenthal Center's list of most wanted war criminals, behind two others believed to be dead.



[Demjanjuk's family insists he is innocent](#)

sac/AFP/dpa/Reuters

Editor: Susan Houlton

<http://www.dw-world.de/dw/article/0,,4902605,00.html>

Ein Nebenkläger im Demjanjuk-Prozeß hat im Vernichtungslager Sobibor Mutter und Bruder verloren.

Ein Gespräch mit Kurt Gutmann, Interview: Ellen Brombacher, 05.12.2009



»Läuse zu haben reichte schon, um vergast zu werden«

Kurt Gutmann ist einer der Nebenkläger in dem am 30. November 2009 begonnenen Prozeß gegen den gebürtigen Ukrainer Iwan Demjanjuk, der im Konzentrationslager Sobibor an der Ermordung von mehr als 27 000 Menschen beteiligt gewesen sein soll.

Sie sind Nebenkläger im Prozeß gegen den mutmaßlichen Kriegsverbrecher Iwan Demjanjuk. Welche persönliche Verbindung haben Sie zu diesem Fall?

Meine Mutter und mein ältester Bruder Hans wurden 1942 von Mülheim/Ruhr in das Ghetto-Lager Izbica deportiert. Als es aufgelöst wurde, brachte man dessen Bewohner zur Vergasung in das nicht weit davon entfernte Lager Sobibor, wo Demjanjuk offenbar Dienst getan hat.

Wo befanden Sie sich zu dieser Zeit?

Seit 1939 war ich in Schottland, wohin meine Mutter mich und meinen Bruder geschickt hatte – so überlebten wir. Mit gut 17 Jahren trat ich in die britische Armee ein und wurde im Herbst 1945 nach Deutschland abkommandiert. In Mülheim erfuhr ich dann von dem Abtransport und daß niemand zurückgekehrt war.

Welche Empfindungen haben Sie, wenn Sie den Angeklagten im Gerichtssaal sehen?

Zunächst einmal empfinde ich das, was Thomas Blatt, ein Sobibor-Überlebender, so ausgedrückt hat: »Er kann derjenige sein, der meine Eltern in die Gaskammer geschickt hat.«

Es ist beinahe unwirklich: Demjanjuk liegt auf einer Trage, hält die Augen geschlossen und dreht uns immer wieder den Rücken zu. Er hat auch mal gebetet – da wurden gerade Listen von Ermordeten verlesen. Darunter waren wenige Monate alte Babys ebenso wie eine 95 Jahre alte Frau. Sie alle sind im Gas erstickt. Nicht nur ich habe dabei geweint.

Zu Beginn des Prozesses hatten drei Gutachter die eingeschränkte Verhandlungsfähigkeit von Demjanjuk festgestellt. Und die Verhandlung am 2. Dezember war

schon nach wenigen Minuten zu Ende, weil sich beim Angeklagten angeblich ein Infekt ankündigte. Geht das Gericht zu schonend mit ihm um?

Ich empfand es als richtig, die Verhandlung an diesem Tag abzubrechen. Dennoch: Unwillkürlich stellt man sich dabei vor, wie in den Konzentrationslagern mit kranken Häftlingen umgegangen wurde. Mitunter reichte es schon, Läuse zu haben, um vergast zu werden.

Dem Verteidiger Demjanjuk wurde von Medien vorgeworfen, er verhöhne die Opfer des Naziregimes. Haben Sie auch diesen Eindruck?

Ich sehe das differenziert. Zunächst einmal empfand ich es als unerträglich, daß der Verteidiger behauptete, die für den Dienst in den KZs verpflichteten ehemaligen Kriegsgefangenen müßten genauso eingestuft werden wie die Juden, die auf Befehl der SS Hilfsdienste im Lager verrichteten. Beide Gruppen hätten nur ihr Leben retten wollen. Diese Gleichsetzung ist inakzeptabel, und die Medien haben das mit Recht kritisiert. Einige Ausführungen der Verteidigung sollten aber Stoff zum Nachdenken geben: Ungezählte SS-Mörder, die in der Befehlskette weit höher standen, wurden von der BRD-Justiz entweder nie verfolgt oder mit der Begründung des »Befehlsnotstandes« freigesprochen.

Demjanjuk's Verteidiger hat jedenfalls die bisherige Rechtspraxis im Umgang mit Naziverbrechern an den Pranger gestellt und darauf hingewiesen, daß da mit zweierlei Maß gemessen wird. Dem kann ich nur zustimmen, denn in der DDR, in der ich gelebt habe, kamen NS-Verbrecher nicht so einfach davon. Es sei denn, sie hatten sich rechtzeitig in den Westen abgesetzt.

Was wünschen Sie sich von diesem Prozeß?

Ich lechze nicht danach, einen 89jährigen Mann im Gefängnis zu sehen. Aber ich will, daß Demjanjuk die Wahrheit sagt und sich für seine Taten entschuldigt. Es ist außerdem wichtig, daß die Nazigreuel mal wieder ins öffentliche Bewußtsein gerückt werden.

Der Prozeß macht aber auch auf die 3,5 Millionen sowjetischen Kriegsgefangenen aufmerksam, die von den deutschen Faschisten ermordet wurden. In wenigen Monaten begehen wir den 65. Jahrestag der Befreiung – wir sollten uns daher auch daran erinnern, daß deutsche Truppen insgesamt an die 20 Millionen Sowjetbürger umgebracht haben und daß sie nur verbrannte Erde hinterließen. Wir dürfen nicht zulassen, daß rechte Historiker den Kampf der Roten Armee auf die Exzesse reduzieren, die es zweifellos gegeben hat, nachdem sowjetische Truppen deutsches Territorium erreicht hatten. Ich jedenfalls bin der Sowjetunion bis an mein Lebensende dankbar für ihren überragenden Anteil an der Zerschlagung des Faschismus.

<http://www.jungewelt.de/2009/12-05/054.php>